

Raher

FOIA Request No.:

Vaughn Index

Monday, October 1, 2012

Page | 1

Randy Taylor	Total number of pages: 410			
Document Description (Folders)	Number of Pages	Pages With Redactions	Exemptions Applied	Rationale For Exemptions
Email dated December 6, 2006, from Randy R. Taylor to Celia Santana, Michael Malone, Matthew D. Nace, and Daniel M. Simpson Re: Fwd: FW: CAR 5 - Matt Nace letter on Transition	Pages 2-3	2	(b)(6)	(b)(6) was applied to redact information of a personal nature that would be maintained in personnel and medical and similar files related to an individual. The release of such information, especially as this information has nothing to do with the Plaintiff's FOIA request, would constitute a clear unwarranted invasion of personal privacy.
Email dated December 11, 2006, from Heather L. Greiner to Randy Taylor. Re. CAR 6 Big Spring option b	Page 9	9	(b)(6)	(b)(6) was applied to redact information of a personal nature that would be maintained in personnel and medical and similar files related to an individual. The release of such information, especially as this information has nothing to do with the Plaintiff's FOIA request, would constitute a clear unwarranted invasion of personal privacy.
Email dated December 11, 2006, from Darlene Ely to Randy Taylor. Re. CAR 6 pricing	Page 15	15	(b)(6)	(b)(6) was applied to redact information of a personal nature that would be maintained in personnel and medical and similar files related to an individual. The release of such information, especially as this information has nothing to do with the Plaintiff's FOIA request, would constitute a clear unwarranted invasion of personal privacy.

Raher

FOIA Request No.:

Vaughn Index

Monday, October 1, 2012

Page | 2

Email dated June 15, 2005, from David Erlewine to Randy Taylor Re: LCS Request to Reform Contract (CAR 6) Draft	Page 40-41	Page 40-41	(b)(5)	(b)(5) was applied to redact intra-agency emails which would not be available by law to a party other than an agency in litigation with the agency. The document in question contains a legal opinion by BOP Attorney David Erlewine to contracting staff concerning LCS Request to Reform Contract (CAR 6). The disclosure of the personal impressions of BOP's agency counsel to staff constitutes a clearly unwarranted invasion of personal privacy of the person providing the impression and the personal privacy of staff that rely on the legal impressions of their agency counsel for an honest and fair assessment to questions. Disclosure of such information negatively impacts the free exchange of communication between decision officials and their agency counsel.
Email dated June 15, 2005, from Randy Taylor to David Erlewine Re: LCS Request to Reform Contract (CAR 6) Draft	Page 42-43	Page 42-43	(b)(5)	(b)(5) was applied to redact intra-agency emails which would not be available by law to a party other than an agency in litigation with the agency. The document in question contains a legal opinion by BOP Attorney David Erlewine to contracting staff concerning LCS Request to Reform Contract (CAR 6). The disclosure of the personal impressions of BOP's agency counsel to staff constitutes a clearly unwarranted invasion of personal privacy of the person providing the impression and the personal privacy of staff that rely on the legal impressions of their agency counsel for an honest and fair assessment to questions. Disclosure of such information negatively impacts the free exchange of communication between decision officials and their agency counsel.
Email dated March 8, 2005, from Connie A. Bare to Beverly Graham and Randy Taylor Re: CAR 5 more changes	Page 61	Page 61	(b)(5)	(b)(5) was applied to redact recommended changes to CAR 5 because the recommended changes represents predicisional determinations by the staff of the BOP. Draft documents are predicisional and ultimately are recommendations until the final document is approved. By exposing edits to the Plaintiff or any potential entity desiring to contract with the BOP, it will reveal the process by which the BOP analyzes contract decisions and those

Raher

FOIA Request No.:

Vaughn Index

Monday, October 1, 2012

Page | 3

				<p>with such information may gain a competitive advantage over contractors without this information. Further, revealing draft documents and the communications by staff appertaining thereto will (1) discourage the open and frank discussions on matters of policy between subordinates and superiors; (2) disclose premature proposed policies before they are finally adopted; and (3) may result in public confusion due to the disclosure of reasons and rationales that were not in fact ultimately the grounds for an agency's action, the disclosure of which would result in harm to the contracting process and operate as a potential competitive disadvantage to those that do not possess this information.</p>
Email dated March 9, 2005, from Connie A. Bare to Randy Taylor and David Erik Erlewine Re: Section M CAR 5	Page 67	Page 67	(b)(5)	<p>(b)(5) was applied to redact recommended changes to CAR 5 because the recommended changes represents predisional determinations by the staff of the BOP. Draft documents are predisional and ultimately are recommendations until the final document is approved. By exposing edits to the Plaintiff or any potential entity desiring to contract with the BOP, it will reveal the process by which the BOP analyzes contract decisions and those with such information may gain a competitive advantage over contractors without this information. Further, revealing draft documents and the communications by staff appertaining thereto will (1) discourage the open and frank discussions on matters of policy between subordinates and superiors; (2) disclose premature proposed policies before they are finally adopted; and (3) may result in public confusion due to the disclosure of reasons and rationales that were not in fact ultimately the grounds for an agency's action, the disclosure of which would result in harm to the contracting process and operate as a potential competitive disadvantage to those that do not possess this information.</p>

Raher

FOIA Request No.:

Vaughn Index

Monday, October 1, 2012

Page | 4

Email dated December 12, 2006, from Randy R. Taylor to Matthew D. Nace. Re. CAR 6 pricing	Page 74	74	(b)(6)	(b)(6) was applied to redact information of a personal nature that would be maintained in personnel and medical and similar files related to an individual. The release of such information, especially as this information has nothing to do with the Plaintiff's FOIA request, would constitute a clear unwarranted invasion of personal privacy.
Email dated December 18, 2006, from Matthew D. Nace to Paul R. Courtney, Thomas Dufort and Randy R. Taylor Re. CAR VI Exhibits for the Director	Page 86	86	(b)(6)	(b)(6) was applied to redact information of a personal nature that would be maintained in personnel and medical and similar files related to an individual. The release of such information, especially as this information has nothing to do with the Plaintiff's FOIA request, would constitute a clear unwarranted invasion of personal privacy.
Email dated December 28, 2006, from Randy R. Taylor to Darlene Ely Re: CAR 6 pricing	99	99	(b)(6)	(b)(6) was applied to redact information of a personal nature that would be maintained in personnel and medical and similar files related to an individual. The release of such information, especially as this information has nothing to do with the Plaintiff's FOIA request, would constitute a clear unwarranted invasion of personal privacy.
Email dated December 28, 2006, from Darlene Ely to Randy R. Taylor Re. CAR 6 pricing	Page 101-102	101	(b)(6)	(b)(6) was applied to redact information of a personal nature that would be maintained in personnel and medical and similar files related to an individual. The release of such information, especially as this information has nothing to do with the Plaintiff's FOIA request, would constitute a clear unwarranted invasion of personal privacy.
Email dated August 11, 2006, from Heather L. Greiner to Randy R. Taylor Re: Fwd: CAR 6 Submission without Option A pricing	Page 187	Page 187	(b)(5)	(b)(5) was applied to redact intra-agency emails which would not be available by law to a party other than an agency in litigation with the agency. The document in question contains a legal opinion by former BOP Attorney Christopher Van Horne to contracting staff concerning CAR 6 Submission without Option A pricing. The disclosure of the personal impressions of BOP's agency counsel to

Raher

FOIA Request No.:

Vaughn Index

Monday, October 1, 2012

Page | 5

				staff constitutes a clearly unwarranted invasion of personal privacy of the person providing the impression and the personal privacy of staff that rely on the legal impressions of their agency counsel for an honest and fair assessment to questions. Disclosure of such information negatively impacts the free exchange of communication between decision officials and their agency counsel.
Email dated August 14, 2006, from Beverly Graham Re: Fwd: CAR 6 Inspection Trip	190-191	190	(b)(2)	(b)(2) was applied to redact the travel authorization codes of staff members. Such travel codes are personnel related codes and solely apply to personnel rules of the agency.
Email dated October 31, 2006, from Matthew D. Nace to Stephanie M Girad and Randy R. Taylor Re: Fwd: RE: CAR VI	Page 218-219	Page 218	(b)(5)	(b)(5) was applied to redact recommended changes to CAR VI because the recommended changes represents predicisional determinations by the staff of the BOP. Draft documents are predicisional and ultimately are recommendations until the final document is approved. By exposing edits to the Plaintiff or any potential entity desiring to contract with the BOP, it will reveal the process by which the BOP analyzes contract decisions and those with such information may gain a competitive advantage over contractors without this information. Further, revealing draft documents and the communications by staff appertaining thereto will (1) discourage the open and frank discussions on matters of policy between subordinates and superiors; (2) disclose premature proposed policies before they are finally adopted; and (3) may result in public confusion due to the disclosure of reasons and rationales that were not in fact ultimately the grounds for an agency's action, the disclosure of which would result in harm to the contracting process and operate as a potential competitive disadvantage to those that do not possess this information.

Raher

FOIA Request No.:

Vaughn Index

Monday, October 1, 2012

Page | 6

Email dated April 18, 2006, from Heather L. Greiner to Randy R. Taylor and Matthew D. Nace Re: Fwd: FW: Chapter III – Affected Environment (CAR)	Page 236-237	Page 236	(b)(5)	(b)(5) was applied to redact intra-agency emails which would not be available by law to a party other than an agency in litigation with the agency. The document in question contains a legal opinion by BOP Attorney Craig Meyers to contracting staff concerning the RFP of CAR 5. The disclosure of the personal impressions of BOP's agency counsel to staff constitutes a clearly unwarranted invasion of personal privacy of the person providing the impression and the personal privacy of staff that rely on the legal impressions of their agency counsel for an honest and fair assessment to questions. Disclosure of such information negatively impacts the free exchange of communication between decision officials and their agency counsel.
Email dated April 18, 2006, from Heather L. Greiner to Isaac Gaston, Bridgette Lyles, Pam J. Chandler, Matthew D. Nace, and Randy R. Taylor Re: Fwd: FW: Chapter III – Affected Environment (CAR)	Page 238-239	Page 238	(b)(5)	(b)(5) was applied to redact intra-agency emails which would not be available by law to a party other than an agency in litigation with the agency. The document in question contains a legal opinion by BOP Attorney Craig Meyers to contracting staff concerning the RFP of CAR 5. The disclosure of the personal impressions of BOP's agency counsel to staff constitutes a clearly unwarranted invasion of personal privacy of the person providing the impression and the personal privacy of staff that rely on the legal impressions of their agency counsel for an honest and fair assessment to questions. Disclosure of such information negatively impacts the free exchange of communication between decision officials and their agency counsel.
Email dated April 18, 2006, from Craig Meyers to Isaac Gaston, Heather L. Greiner, Robert Nardi, Pam J. Chandler, Bridgette Lyles, Matthew D. Nace, and Randy R. Taylor Re: Fwd:	Page 240-241	Page 240	(b)(5)	(b)(5) was applied to redact intra-agency emails which would not be available by law to a party other than an agency in litigation with the agency. The document in question contains a legal opinion by BOP Attorney Craig Meyers to contracting staff concerning the RFP of CAR 5. The disclosure of the personal impressions of BOP's agency counsel to staff constitutes a clearly unwarranted invasion of personal privacy of the person providing the impression and the

Raher

FOIA Request No.:

Vaughn Index

Monday, October 1, 2012

Page | 7

FW: Chapter III – Affected Environment (CAR)				personal privacy of staff that rely on the legal impressions of their agency counsel for an honest and fair assessment to questions. Disclosure of such information negatively impacts the free exchange of communication between decision officials and their agency counsel.
Email dated April 18, 2006, from Heather L. Greiner to Craig Meyers, Isaac Gaston, Robert Nardi, Bridgette Lyles, Matthew D. Nace, Pam J. Chandler, and Randy R. Taylor Re: Fwd: FW: Chapter III – Affected Environment (CAR)	Page 243-244	Page 243	(b)(5)	(b)(5) was applied to redact intra-agency emails which would not be available by law to a party other than an agency in litigation with the agency. The document in question contains a legal opinion by BOP Attorney Craig Meyers to contracting staff concerning the RFP of CAR 5. The disclosure of the personal impressions of BOP's agency counsel to staff constitutes a clearly unwarranted invasion of personal privacy of the person providing the impression and the personal privacy of staff that rely on the legal impressions of their agency counsel for an honest and fair assessment to questions. Disclosure of such information negatively impacts the free exchange of communication between decision officials and their agency counsel.
Email dated April 18, 2006, from Craig Meyers to Isaac Gaston, Heather L. Greiner, Robert Nardi, Pam J. Chandler, Bridgette Lyles, Matthew D. Nace, and Randy R. Taylor Re: Fwd: FW: Chapter III – Affected Environment (CAR)	Page 245	Page 245	(b)(5)	(b)(5) was applied to redact intra-agency emails which would not be available by law to a party other than an agency in litigation with the agency. The document in question contains a legal opinion by BOP Attorney Craig Meyers to contracting staff concerning the RFP of CAR 5. The disclosure of the personal impressions of BOP's agency counsel to staff constitutes a clearly unwarranted invasion of personal privacy of the person providing the impression and the personal privacy of staff that rely on the legal impressions of their agency counsel for an honest and fair assessment to questions. Disclosure of such information negatively impacts the free exchange of communication between decision officials and their agency counsel.

Raher

FOIA Request No.:

Vaughn Index

Monday, October 1, 2012

Page | 8

Email dated April 18, 2006, from Heather L. Greiner to Craig Meyers, Isaac Gaston, Robert Nardi, Bridgette Lyles, Matthew D. Nace, Pam J. Chandler, and Randy R. Taylor Re: Fwd: FW: Chapter III – Affected Environment (CAR)	Page 246-247	Page 246	(b)(5)	(b)(5) was applied to redact intra-agency emails which would not be available by law to a party other than an agency in litigation with the agency. The document in question contains a legal opinion by BOP Attorney Craig Meyers to contracting staff concerning the RFP of CAR 5. The disclosure of the personal impressions of BOP's agency counsel to staff constitutes a clearly unwarranted invasion of personal privacy of the person providing the impression and the personal privacy of staff that rely on the legal impressions of their agency counsel for an honest and fair assessment to questions. Disclosure of such information negatively impacts the free exchange of communication between decision officials and their agency counsel.
Email dated June 16, 2005, from Randy R. Taylor to Carey Cleland, Connie A. Bare, Beverly Graham, and Matthew D. Nace Re: CAR 5 Solicitation	Page 307-308	Page 307-308	(b)(5)	(b)(5) was applied to redact recommended changes to CAR 5 Solicitation because the recommended changes represents predicational determinations by the staff of the BOP. Draft documents are predicational and ultimately are recommendations until the final document is approved. By exposing edits to the Plaintiff or any potential entity desiring to contract with the BOP, it will reveal the process by which the BOP analyzes contract decisions and those with such information may gain a competitive advantage over contractors without this information. Further, revealing draft documents and the communications by staff appertaining thereto will (1) discourage the open and frank discussions on matters of policy between subordinates and superiors; (2) disclose premature proposed policies before they are finally adopted; and (3) may result in public confusion due to the disclosure of reasons and rationales that were not in fact ultimately the grounds for an agency's action, the disclosure of which would result in harm to the contracting process and operate as a potential competitive disadvantage to those that do not possess this information.

Raher

FOIA Request No.:

Vaughn Index

Monday, October 1, 2012

Page | 9

Email dated June 16, 2005, from Charles Mitchell to Connie A. Bare, Carey Cleland, Jerome D. Kesler, and Matthew D. Nace Re: Fwd: CAR 5 Solicitation	Page 309	Page 309	(b)(5)	(b)(5) was applied to redact recommended changes to CAR 5 Solicitation because the recommended changes represents predisional determinations by the staff of the BOP. Draft documents are predisional and ultimately are recommendations until the final document is approved. By exposing edits to the Plaintiff or any potential entity desiring to contract with the BOP, it will reveal the process by which the BOP analyzes contract decisions and those with such information may gain a competitive advantage over contractors without this information. Further, revealing draft documents and the communications by staff appertaining thereto will (1) discourage the open and frank discussions on matters of policy between subordinates and superiors; (2) disclose premature proposed policies before they are finally adopted; and (3) may result in public confusion due to the disclosure of reasons and rationales that were not in fact ultimately the grounds for an agency's action, the disclosure of which would result in harm to the contracting process and operate as a potential competitive disadvantage to those that do not possess this information.
Email dated June 16, 2005, from Beverly Graham to Randy R. Taylor Re: CAR 5 Solicitation	Page 310-311	Page 310-311	(b)(5)	(b)(5) was applied to redact recommended changes to CAR 5 Solicitation because the recommended changes represents predisional determinations by the staff of the BOP. Draft documents are predisional and ultimately are recommendations until the final document is approved. By exposing edits to the Plaintiff or any potential entity desiring to contract with the BOP, it will reveal the process by which the BOP analyzes contract decisions and those with such information may gain a competitive advantage over contractors without this information. Further, revealing draft documents and the communications by staff appertaining thereto will (1) discourage the open and frank discussions on matters of policy between subordinates and superiors; (2) disclose premature proposed policies before they are finally adopted; and (3) may result in public

Raher

FOIA Request No.:

Vaughn Index

Monday, October 1, 2012

Page | 10

				confusion due to the disclosure of reasons and rationales that were not in fact ultimately the grounds for an agency's action, the disclosure of which would result in harm to the contracting process and operate as a potential competitive disadvantage to those that do not possess this information.
Email dated June 16, 2005, from Randy Taylor to Beverly Graham Re: CAR 5 Solicitation	Page 312-313	Page 312-313	(b)(5)	(b)(5) was applied to redact recommended changes to CAR 5 Solicitation because the recommended changes represents predisional determinations by the staff of the BOP. Draft documents are predisional and ultimately are recommendations until the final document is approved. By exposing edits to the Plaintiff or any potential entity desiring to contract with the BOP, it will reveal the process by which the BOP analyzes contract decisions and those with such information may gain a competitive advantage over contractors without this information. Further, revealing draft documents and the communications by staff appertaining thereto will (1) discourage the open and frank discussions on matters of policy between subordinates and superiors; (2) disclose premature proposed policies before they are finally adopted; and (3) may result in public confusion due to the disclosure of reasons and rationales that were not in fact ultimately the grounds for an agency's action, the disclosure of which would result in harm to the contracting process and operate as a potential competitive disadvantage to those that do not possess this information.
Email dated June 16, 2005, from Beverly Graham to Randy R. Taylor Re: CAR 5 Solicitation	Page 314-315	Page 314-315	(b)(5)	(b)(5) was applied to redact recommended changes to CAR 5 Solicitation because the recommended changes represents predisional determinations by the staff of the BOP. Draft documents are predisional and ultimately are recommendations until the final document is approved. By exposing edits to the Plaintiff or any potential entity desiring to contract with the BOP, it will reveal the process by which the BOP analyzes contract decisions

Raher

FOIA Request No.:

Vaughn Index

Monday, October 1, 2012

Page | 11

				<p>and those with such information may gain a competitive advantage over contractors without this information. Further, revealing draft documents and the communications by staff appertaining thereto will (1) discourage the open and frank discussions on matters of policy between subordinates and superiors; (2) disclose premature proposed policies before they are finally adopted; and (3) may result in public confusion due to the disclosure of reasons and rationales that were not in fact ultimately the grounds for an agency's action, the disclosure of which would result in harm to the contracting process and operate as a potential competitive disadvantage to those that do not possess this information.</p>
Email dated June 16, 2005, from Carey Cleland to Randy R. Taylor Re: CAR 5 Solicitation	Page 316-317	Page 316-317	(b)(5)	<p>(b)(5) was applied to redact recommended changes to CAR 5 Solicitation because the recommended changes represents predisional determinations by the staff of the BOP. Draft documents are predisional and ultimately are recommendations until the final document is approved. By exposing edits to the Plaintiff or any potential entity desiring to contract with the BOP, it will reveal the process by which the BOP analyzes contract decisions and those with such information may gain a competitive advantage over contractors without this information. Further, revealing draft documents and the communications by staff appertaining thereto will (1) discourage the open and frank discussions on matters of policy between subordinates and superiors; (2) disclose premature proposed policies before they are finally adopted; and (3) may result in public confusion due to the disclosure of reasons and rationales that were not in fact ultimately the grounds for an agency's action, the disclosure of which would result in harm to the contracting process an operate as a potential competitive disadvantage to those that do not possess this information.</p>

Raher

FOIA Request No.:

Vaughn Index

Monday, October 1, 2012

Page | 12

Email dated August 14, 2006, from Beverly Graham Re: Fwd: CAR 6 Inspection Trip	361	361	(b)(6)	(b)(6) was applied to redact information of a personal nature that would be maintained in personnel and medical and similar files related to an individual. The release of such information, especially as this information has nothing to do with the Plaintiff's FOIA request, would constitute a clear unwarranted invasion of personal privacy.
Email dated April 17, 2006, from Heather L. Greiner to Randy R. Taylor and Matthew D. Nace Re: Fwd: Comments on Draft Chaps for CAR V	Page 377-378	Page 377	(b)(5)	(b)(5) was applied to redact intra-agency emails which would not be available by law to a party other than an agency in litigation with the agency. The document in question contains a legal opinion by BOP Attorney Craig Meyers to contracting staff concerning CAR 5. The disclosure of the personal impressions of BOP's agency counsel to staff constitutes a clearly unwarranted invasion of personal privacy of the person providing the impression and the personal privacy of staff that rely on the legal impressions of their agency counsel for an honest and fair assessment to questions. Disclosure of such information negatively impacts the free exchange of communication between decision officials and their agency counsel.
Email dated April 17, 2006, from Heather L. Greiner to Matthew D. Nace and Randy R. Taylor Re: Fwd: Comments on Draft Chaps for CAR V	Page 380-381	Page 380	(b)(5)	(b)(5) was applied to redact intra-agency emails which would not be available by law to a party other than an agency in litigation with the agency. The document in question contains a legal opinion by BOP Attorney Craig Meyers to contracting staff concerning CAR 5. The disclosure of the personal impressions of BOP's agency counsel to staff constitutes a clearly unwarranted invasion of personal privacy of the person providing the impression and the personal privacy of staff that rely on the legal impressions of their agency counsel for an honest and fair assessment to questions. Disclosure of such information negatively impacts the free exchange of communication between decision officials and their agency counsel.

Raher

FOIA Request No.:

Vaughn Index

Monday, October 1, 2012

Page | 13

Pre-Solicitation Notice (DRAFT)	Page 401	Page 401	(b)(5)	(b)(5) was applied to redact recommended the Pre-Solicitation Notice (Draft) because draft documents are predisional and ultimately are recommendations until the final document is approved. By exposing edits to the Plaintiff or any potential entity desiring to contract with the BOP, it will reveal the process by which the BOP analyzes contract decisions and those with such information may gain a competitive advantage over contractors without this information. Further, revealing draft documents and the communications by staff appertaining thereto will (1) discourage the open and frank discussions on matters of policy between subordinates and superiors; (2) disclose premature proposed policies before they are finally adopted; and (3) may result in public confusion due to the disclosure of reasons and rationales that were not in fact ultimately the grounds for an agency's action, the disclosure of which would result in harm to the contracting process and operate as a potential competitive disadvantage to those that do not possess this information.
Fixed Price Award Fee (DRAFT)	Page 407-408	Page 407-408	(b)(5)	(b)(5) was applied to redact recommended the Fixed Price Award Fee (Draft) because draft documents are predisional and ultimately are recommendations until the final document is approved. By exposing edits to the Plaintiff or any potential entity desiring to contract with the BOP, it will reveal the process by which the BOP analyzes contract decisions and those with such information may gain a competitive advantage over contractors without this information. Further, revealing draft documents and the communications by staff appertaining thereto will (1) discourage the open and frank discussions on matters of policy between subordinates and superiors; (2) disclose premature proposed policies before they are finally adopted; and (3) may result in public confusion due to the disclosure of reasons and rationales that were not in fact ultimately the grounds for an agency's action, the

Raher

FOIA Request No.:

Vaughn Index

Monday, October 1, 2012

Page | 14

				disclosure of which would result in harm to the contracting process and operate as a potential competitive disadvantage to those that do not possess this information.
Attachments Supervisory Review of the Contract Compliance Section of the Bureau's Central Office	15	15	Non-Responsive	Non-responsive to the FOIA request. Compliance and Review section (internal contract auditing section) does a review of Bureau contracts before the solicitation is posted, an award is made (exceeding 1 million) or on modifications (exceeding \$500,000).